

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are currently pending. Claim 3 has been amended to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1, 13, 20-26, 29-30, 32-36, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0051737.

For a claim to be anticipated, each and every non-inherent claim limitation must be disclosed in a reference. MPEP 2131.

Claim 1 recites “**A method to operate a plurality of mobile terminals**, comprising storing an editable object in the plurality of mobile terminals, and simultaneously editing the editable object using at least some of the plurality of mobile terminals, **where the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of mobile terminals.**”

Claim 24 recites “**A computer program** stored on a computer readable media for directing a computer to execute a method that comprises **storing an editable object in a mobile terminal that is a member of a set of mobile terminals**; editing the editable object in the mobile terminal; and **transmitting edit commands to other members of the set of mobile terminals.**”

Claim 25 recites “**A mobile terminal**, comprising a wireless transceiver, a data processor, and a memory **for use in storing an editable object, editing the editable object and transmitting, via the wireless transceiver, edit commands to other members of a set of mobile terminals that also store and edit the same editable object.**”

Claim 26 recites “**A wireless communication system** comprising a plurality of mobile terminals **at least one comprising means for editing an editable object and for transmitting information that comprises edit commands, via the wireless communications system, to others of the plurality of mobile terminals for implementing collaborative editing of said editable object.**”

The claimed invention provides “a method and device for the viewing, editing, and dissemination of an editable object during real-time mobile collaboration sessions” (page 3, lines 4-6, of Applicant’s specification) and allows each user to control their own version management (page 4, lines 8-12, of Applicant’s specification).

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

The Patent Office asserted (page 2, lines 19-21, of the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005; and repeats this on page 3, lines 7-11, of the Office Action mailed on April 21, 2006) that Lin discloses the limitation of “where the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of mobile terminals (col. 3, par. [0039-0040]).”

In the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006, (page 3, lines 7-11) the Patent Office also asserted “[0030-0031] “editing/command-setting can be transmitted between two mobile devices””.

Lin (paragraphs 0030-0031) disclose

[0030] There are several figures used to illustrate the present invention in this preferred embodiment, thus, FIG. 1 is the diagram for system architecture of the present invention. As shown, a server 100 is connected to a database 102, and the server 100 comprises three modules which is a database setting module 100a, project management module 100b, and data synchronization module 100c. The first mobile device 104 is a personal digital assistant, which uses Palm as its operation system, and the second mobile device 106 is a personal digital assistant 106, which uses Win CE as its operation system. The first mobile device 104 and the second mobile device 106 can be data synchronized with server 100 via data synchronization. The first mobile device 104 and the second mobile device 106, both can access data via a wireless connection. Therefore, data transmission between the first mobile device 104 and the second mobile device 106 can be achieved by a wired or wireless connection. The data synchronization mentioned above can also install or remove software inside the personal digital assistant.

[0031] User's can create a customized project by interface-editing/command-setting module 108 that can be installed onto a server 100 or any other computers connected to the server 100. The user needs to complete three steps to activate the interface-editing/command-setting module 108. As shown in FIG. 2, the three steps are interface layout setting 200, function key setting 202, and database connecting setting 204. Thereby a new project setting file is created and transmitted to the database setting module 100b within server 100.

However, Lin does not disclose “the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

mobile terminals,” (claim 1) “transmitting edit commands to other members of the set of mobile terminals,” (claim 24) “A mobile terminal . . . for . . . transmitting, via the wireless transceiver, edit commands to other members of a set of mobile terminals that also store and edit the same editable object,” (claim 25) and “at least one comprising means . . . for transmitting information that comprises edit commands, via the wireless communications system, to others of the plurality of mobile terminals for implementing collaborative editing of said editable object” (claim 26). Instead of transmitting edit commands from one mobile terminal to other mobile terminals, Lin discloses “a new project setting file” and “transmitting the new project setting file to project the management module 100b within the server 100” (paragraph [0039], lines 3-4) and the “database 102 transmits the results to a dada (*sic*) synchronization module 100c, and then the data synchronization module 100c will download the data record onto the mobile device” (paragraph [0039], lines 15-18). Lin also discloses (paragraph [0031], lines 1-4) users can create a customized project by interface-editing/command-setting module 108 that can be installed onto a server 100 or any other computers connected to the server. It appears the Lin considers a mobile device not to be a computer (see, e.g., paragraph [0007], line 7). Lin also discloses that a mobile device communicates with the server (paragraph [0042], lines 1-2) and does not disclose sending edit commands between mobile terminals, as has been claimed.

Thus, claims 1-62 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 33 recites “where the editable object further comprises audio data.”

The Patent Office asserted ‘Lin further discloses a wireless communications system as described in claim 32, where the editable object further comprises audio data (col. 3, par. [0039-0040]).’

However Lin does not disclose or suggest audio data. Instead, Lin, in paragraphs 0039 and 0040, discloses synchronizing first and second mobile devices and using Standard Query Language.

Thus, claim 33 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

It is noted that claims 34 and 36 have been rejected as anticipated by Lin. Claim 34 recites “A wireless communication system as described in claim 27, where information in the shared area is automatically synchronized between all users.” Claim 36 recites “A wireless communication system as described in claim 27, where at least one of the shared edited instances

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

is downloaded from the user's shared area to the user's personal area." Both claims depend from claim 27. In the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006, the Patent Office rejected claim 27 as being obvious in view of Lin and Lee and asserted (page 6, lines 12-14, of the April 21, 2006, Office Action) "Lin does not disclose where a memory area of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises a working memory area used during editing and a permanent storage memory area." According, as claims 34 and 36 include the subject matter of claim 27, claims 34 and 36 are therefore not anticipated by Lin.

The Patent Office rejected claims 2 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Lee, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0015548.

Claim 2 recites "where a memory area of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises a working memory area used during editing and a permanent storage memory area."

Claim 3 recites "where the memory area of a plurality of mobile terminals further comprises a personal area and a shared area."

Claim 11 recites "where the information in the shared area is automatically synchronized between all users."

Claim 12 recites "where the information in the personal area comprises at least one edited instance of the editable object."

Claim 27 recites "where the mobile terminal further comprises a memory area divided into a working memory area and a permanent storage memory area, further logically divided into a personal area and a shared area, where information in the personal area includes at least one edited instance of the editable object."

The Patent Office asserted (page 6, lines 1-8, of the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005; repeated on page 6, lines 11-19, in the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006) "Lin does not disclose where a memory area of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises a working memory area used during editing and a permanent storage memory area. Lee discloses where a memory area of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises a working memory area used during editing and a permanent storage memory area (col. 3, par. [0033]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the memory as taught by Lee to the method of Lin order to expand the storage."

It does not appear that the method and system of Lin are modifiable by Lee. Lin discloses

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

mobile device to server (or other computer) communications only. Lin does not disclose that a message or command from a first mobile device is sent to a second mobile device either directly or via a computer such as a server. The target area for technology of Lin is in inventory management (paragraphs [0004] through [0008]) where the ability to obtain up to date stock information is important. Lin does not discuss messaging between employees regarding stock information. For the state invention management problem of Lin, having a centralized database is optimal. Lee is directed to chat sessions. Chat sessions involve the sharing of personal information between the users of a chat session. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill would not look to Lee, concerned with chat session management, to modify the system and method of Lin.

Thus, claims 2 and 27 are allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

It is not understood why claims 3, 11, and 12 are considered obvious in view of Lin and Lee in the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006, when they were considered allowable in the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005, where the Patent Office asserted “As to claim 3, the prior art of record do not disclose method as in claim 1, where the memory area of a plurality of mobile terminals further comprises a personal area and a shared area.” It is not understood why the Patent Office asserted (page 6, Office Action mailed April 21, 2006) “As to claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2” because claim 2 recites “where a memory area of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises a working memory area used during editing and a permanent storage memory area” while claim 3 recites “where the memory area of a plurality of mobile terminals further comprises a personal area and a shared area.” It is believed that claim 3 and also claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the prior art of record as indicated on page 8 of the Office Action mailed July 21, 2006.

The Patent Office asserted (page 6, line 21, through page 7, line 1, of the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006) “As to claim 11, Lee further discloses method as described in claim 3, where the information in the shared area is automatically synchronized between all users (col. 5, par. [0044]).” Lee, in paragraph 0044, does not appear to disclose claim 11’s recited subject matter of “where the information in the shared area is automatically synchronized between all users.” Instead, Lee discloses that an inbound chat message may have time stamps, sequence numbers, etc.

Thus, claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

The Patent Office asserted (page 7, lines 2-4, of the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006) “As to claim 12, Lee further discloses a method as described in claim 3, where the information in the personal area comprises at least one edited instance of the editable object (col. 6, par. [0049]).” Lee, paragraph 0049, does not appear to disclose claim 12’s recited subject matter of “where the information in the personal area comprises at least one edited instance of the editable object.” Instead, Lee discloses a buddy list display that has a buddy’s presence indicator, the buddy’s nickname, and/or the buddy’s short name indicator – none of which appear to be an edited instance of an editable object.

Thus, claim 12 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

The Patent Office rejected claims 4-10, 37-40, and 46-62 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Gelernter, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0139396.

Claims 4-10, 48, 58, and 59 depend from claim 1.

Claims 54, 56, and 60 depend from claim 24.

Claims 55, 57, and 61 depend from claim 25.

Claims 37-40, 46, 47, 49-53, and 62 depend from claim 26.

Claim 1 recites “**A method to operate a plurality of mobile terminals**, comprising storing an editable object in the plurality of mobile terminals, and simultaneously editing the editable object using at least some of the plurality of mobile terminals, **where the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of mobile terminals.**”

Claim 24 recites “**A computer program** stored on a computer readable media for directing a computer to execute a method that comprises **storing an editable object in a mobile terminal that is a member of a set of mobile terminals**; editing the editable object in the mobile terminal; and **transmitting edit commands to other members of the set of mobile terminals.**”

Claim 25 recites “**A mobile terminal**, comprising a wireless transceiver, a data processor, and a memory **for** use in storing an editable object, editing the editable object and **transmitting, via the wireless transceiver, edit commands to other members of a set of mobile terminals that also store and edit the same editable object.**”

Claim 26 recites “A wireless communication system comprising a plurality of mobile terminals **at least one comprising means for editing an editable object and for transmitting information that comprises edit commands, via the wireless communications system, to others of the plurality of mobile terminals for implementing collaborative editing of said editable object.**”

Although paragraph 7 (page 7, lines 6-7, of the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006) refers to Lee in view of Gelernter, the Patent Office makes no other reference to Lee, but, instead, refers to Lin (page 7, line 8, and page 8, line 1, of the Office Action mailed April 21, 2006). Needless to say, the layout of the rejection of claims 4-10, 37-40, and 46-62 is confusing.

Lee relates to a system and method for presenting chat group sessions at wireless mobile terminals (abstract). The text edit area (e.g., abstract, paragraph 0098) appears to be unique to an individual mobile terminal and does not appear to involve the transmission of edit commands to other mobile terminals.

Lin, as discussed above, does not disclose the claimed subject matter of independent claims 1, 24, 25, or 26.

Claim 4 recites “A method as in claim 1, where at least one of the plurality of mobile terminals initiates an editing process whereby information comprising at least one of a hard copy or edited instance is sent from at least one mobile terminal to at least one other of the plurality of mobile terminals.”

Although Gelernter (paragraph 0158) discloses a user may login and perform activities, such as sending email, Gelernter does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest claim 4’s subject matter of “at least one of the plurality of mobile terminals initiates an editing process whereby information comprising at least one of a hard copy or edited instance is sent from at least one mobile terminal to at least one other of the plurality of mobile terminals.” Thus, claims 4-10 are allowable over Lee (or, Lin) in view of Gelernter.

Claims 37-40 recite “where each editable object comprises at least a content part and at least one comment field.” Even though Gelernter appears to disclose an email and a live video feed in a stream document object model (paragraph 0020), Gelernter does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest each editable object comprises a content part and at least one comment field. Thus, claims 37-40 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

As to claim 46, Gelernter (paragraph 0158) does not appear to disclose “the information comprises a user’s Own Edited Instance and at least one other user’s Shared Edit Instances.”

As to claim 47, Gelernter (paragraphs 0033, 0037) does not appear to disclose a watermark.

As to claims 47-49, Gelernter (paragraphs 0158-0160) does not appear to disclose a list of edit commands or a watermark.

As to claims 49-57 and 59, Gelernter (paragraphs 0020, 0033) does not appear to disclose a list of edit commands, an editable video object, an editable image object, or an editable object sourced for an image archive or an image capture device.

As to claim 58, where in paragraphs 0139-0140, does Gelernter disclose “A method as in claim 1, further comprising utilizing control bits for each mobile terminal of the plurality of mobile terminals to provide contextual updates to other ones of the plurality of mobile devices?”

As to claims 60 and 61, Gelernter does not appear to disclose a list of edit commands in the mobile terminal and a list of edit commands of other mobile terminals in that mobile terminal in paragraph 0158.

As to claim 58, Gelernter (paragraphs 0058-0062) appears to disclose server and non-server topologies, but does not appear to disclose “A method as in claim 1, further comprising utilizing control bits for each mobile terminal of the plurality of mobile terminals to provide contextual updates to other ones of the plurality of mobile devices.”

The Patent Office has not addressed claim 62 which recites “A wireless communication system as described claim 26, where each one of the plurality of mobile terminals comprises means for editing an editable object and for transmitting information that comprises edit commands, via the wireless communications system, to others of the plurality of mobile terminals for implementing collaborative editing of said editable object.” As Gelernter, Lee, and Lin do not appear to disclose or fairly suggest this limitation, claim 62 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 19 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Egawa, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0125126.

Claim 19 and 41 each assert “where each edited instance has a unique ID associated with it.”

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

Claims 19 and 41 are allowable because they depend from base claims 1 and 26, respectively.

The Patent Office rejected claims 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Henriksson, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0052341.

Claim 28 asserts “where the information further comprises a user’s Own Edited Instance.”

Claim 31 asserts “where the information further comprises contextual information to convey coordination, control and status information regarding the collaborative editing of the editable object.”

Lin, as described above, discloses a server that maintains a database. The target area for technology of Lin is in inventory management (paragraphs [0004] through [0008]) where the ability to obtain up to date stock information is important. Lin does not discuss messaging between employees regarding stock information. For the state invention management problem of Lin, having a centralized database is optimal.

Henriksson represents non-analogous art with respect to Lin. Henriksson is directed to two overlaid displays to selectively view or focus on data on the first and/ or second display by optically altering his/ her focus (paragraph [0004]) to display text, symbols, messages or icons (paragraph [0033], lines 7-10) and provide other visual interaction (paragraph [0031], lines 1-2). Henriksson also discloses that a document may be displayed so as to present different related images on the two overlaid displays (paragraphs [0037] to [0038]).

One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modifying Lin by Henriksson. Were Henriksson to be implementable in the system and method of Lin, it would involve the overlaying of two displays in a mobile device and would not involve the transmission of information from one mobile terminal to another.

Thus, claims 28 and 31 are not made obvious by Lin and Henriksson and are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office has not addressed the merits of claims 14-18. Thus, it is believed that the subject matter of claims 14-18 is deemed patentable by the Patent Office.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims 1, 13, 20-26, 29-30, 32-36, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and claims 2, 19, 27, 28, 31, 41, and 46-62 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) based on Lin and Lee, Egawa, Gelernter, or Henriksson,

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

and to allow all of the pending claims 1-62 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/666,875
Art Unit: 2617

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski July 17, 2006
Walter J. Malinowski Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

7-17-06
Date

Ann Obrontowich
Name of Person Making Deposit